UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/726,973	11/30/2000	Brian M. Siegel	SONYNJ 3.0-027	1722

530 7590 03/10/2004

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK
600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST
WESTFIELD, NJ 07090

EXAMINER	
LIN, KENNY S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	6

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

7

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/726,973	SIEGEL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kenny Lin	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 November 2000*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *4*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-18 are presented for examination.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: holes have been punched through the application disclosure while the application is assembled. Applicant is required to submit a new copy of the specification and claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 7-8, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cuomo et al (hereinafter Cuomo), US 6,286,043, in view of Britton et al (hereinafter Britton), US 6,654,814.

5. As per claim 1, Cuomo taught the invention substantially as claimed a method of personalizing information presented at a host web site comprising:

a. Obtaining personal data about a user during a visit to the host web site (col.4, lines 1-3, 7-10, 45-50, col.6, lines 11-13);

b. After obtaining the personal data, monitoring the content of other web sites visited by the user (col.3, lines 7-12, col.6, lines 11-19); and

c. During a subsequent visit by the user to the host web site, personalizing the information presented to the user (col.3, lines 7-9, col.6, lines 61-67).

6. Cuomo did not specifically teach that wherein the content of the information presented to the user during the subsequent visit to the host web site is related to the content of the other web sites visited by the user. Britton taught to tailor the contents of the other web sites (col.3, lines 29-39, 47-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Cuomo and Britton because Britton's teaching of tailoring the contents of different web sites enables Cuomo's method to present a personalized web page containing contents of different web sites that are tailored.

7. As per claim 15, a method of personalizing information presented to a user of a host web site comprising:

a. Collecting identifying data about the user during a first visit to the host web site (col.4, lines 1-3, 7-10, 45-50, col.6, lines 11-13);

b. After collecting the identifying data, monitoring the content of other web sites visited by the user (col.3, lines 7-12, col.6, lines 11-19); and

c. During a subsequent visit by the user to the host web site, personalizing the information presented to the user based upon the identifying data collected about the user (col.3, lines 7-9, col.6, lines 61-67).

8. Cuomo did not specifically teach that wherein the personalized information presented to the user is based upon the content of the other web sites visited by the user. Britton taught to tailor the contents of the other web sites (col.3, lines 29-39, 47-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Cuomo and Britton because Britton's teaching of tailoring the contents of different web sites enables Cuomo's method to present a personalized web page containing contents of different web sites that are tailored.

9. As per claim 2, Cuomo and Britton taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Cuomo further taught that wherein the content of the information presented to the user during the subsequent visit to the host web site is related to the personal data obtained from the user (col.6, lines 61-67).

10. As per claim 7, Cuomo and Britton taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 2. Cuomo further taught to continuously updating the content of the information presented to the user during each subsequent visit to the host web site, wherein the content of the information is updated in response to any changes in the personal data for the user or in the content of the other web sites visited by the user (col.4, lines 1-3, 7-10, 45-50, col.6, lines 11-13).

11. As per claim 8, Cuomo and Britton taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Cuomo further taught that wherein the content of the other web sites visited by the user includes the URL addresses of the visited web sites (col.7, lines 24-29).

12. As per claim 13, Cuomo and Britton taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Cuomo further taught that wherein the personal data about the user includes any information used to identify the user as a unique individual (col.7, lines 24-29).

13. Claims 4-6, 9-12 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cuomo and Britton as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of "Official Notice".

14. As per claims 4 and 16, Cuomo and Britton taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 15. Cuomo further taught to comprise:

a. Placing profile on a hard disk of the user (col.5, lines 64-67, col.6, lines 1-2); and
b. Recording the personal data about the user and the content of the other web sites visited by the user on the profile (col.5, liens 64-67, col.6, lines 1-2).

15. Cuomo and Britton did not specifically teach that the profile is in the form of a cookie. However, Official Notice is taken that the concept and advantage of using cookies to store web related profile is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Cuomo,

Britton and the use of cookies to store the user profile as a cookie on a hard disk on the user's workstation.

16. As per claims 5 and 17, Cuomo and Britton taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 4 and 16. Cuomo further taught to retrieve from the cookie the personal data of the user and the content of the other web sites visited by the user (col.7, lines 12-29).

17. As per claims 6 and 18, Cuomo and Britton taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 5 and 17. Cuomo and Britton did not specifically teach that wherein the personal data of the user and the content of the other web sites visited by the user are retrieved from the cookie during each subsequent visit to the host web site. However, Official Notice is taken that the limitation of retrieving information from a cookie when accessing the corresponding web site of the cookie is essential and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Cuomo, Britton and the use of cookie to retrieve information from the cookie each time the user accesses the host web site.

18. As per claims 9-11, Cuomo and Britton taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Cuomo and Britton did not specifically teach that wherein the content of the other web sites visited by the user includes the length of time spent viewing, any applets that are downloaded or the number of times the user visits each of the other web sites. Official Notice is taken that the limitation narrowed by these claims are considered obvious and furthermore a

matter of design choice in obtaining statistics or information. Since applicants have not disclosed that the claimed limitation solve any stated problem or are for any particular purpose, it appears that the invention would perform equally well without the claimed features. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include different statistics tracking or calculation and downloaded applets that is needed to support the web site as part of the content obtained.

19. As per claim 12, Cuomo and Britton taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Cuomo and Britton did not specifically teach to comprise presenting the personalized information on a device selected from the group consisting of personal computers, a laptop computer, set top boxes, wireless phones, pagers and personal digital assistants. However, Official Notice is taken that the limitations narrowed by this claim is considered obvious and furthermore a matter of design choice, since applicants have not disclosed that the claimed limitations solve any stated problem or are of any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well without these claimed features. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to efficiently utilize the claimed method in all types of presenting devices.

20. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cuomo and Britton as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Subramonian et al (hereinafter Subramonian), US 6,701,362.

21. As per claim 3, Cuomo and Britton taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Cuomo and Britton did not specifically teach to further comprising obtaining authorization form the user to monitor the other web sites visited by the user. Subramonian taught that the monitoring and collecting step is performed only if it authorized by the user (col.11, lines 66-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Cuomo, Britton and Subramonian because Subramonian's teaching of authorizing prior to collecting and monitoring user activities would prevent Cuomo and Britton's method from invading the privacy of the users.

22. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cuomo and Britton as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Nickerson et al (hereinafter Nickerson), US 6,606,581.

23. As per claim 14, Cuomo and Britton taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Cuomo and Britton did not specifically teach wherein the personal data includes the user's name, address, zip code, occupation, phone number, education level, income, marital status, citizenship, home ownership status, age and health. Nickerson taught to include user's name, address, zip code, occupation, phone number, education level, income, marital status, home ownership status, age and other personal information as the personal data (col.15, lines 61-67, col.6, lines 1-8). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Cuomo, Britton and Nickerson because

Nickerson's teaching of personal data requirement would provide a more detailed personal data collection in Cuomo and Britton's method.

Conclusion

24. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Sathyanarayan, US 6,691,106.

25. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenny Lin whose telephone number is (703)305-0438. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM Tuesday to Friday and every other Monday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. Additionally, the fax numbers for Group 2100 are as follows:

Official Responses: (703) 872-9306

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-6121.

ksl
March 5, 2004

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100